

REMARKS

Applicants submit this Amendment in reply to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2006.

At the outset, Applicants propose to amend claims 33, 40 and 47 by adding the limitation “wherein the mould includes means for retaining the plurality of studs in the seats, and the retaining means is separated from the plurality of studs.”

The originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings fully support the proposed amendments to claims 33, 40, 47. In particular, support for the phrase “wherein the mould includes means for retaining the plurality of studs in the seats, and the retaining means is separated from the plurality of studs” is shown in Figure 2b, in which it shows that retaining means 205 is separated from and not contacting the stud 210/211.

In the final Office Action dated March 7, 2006, claims 33, 34, 40, 41, 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,770,013 to Crooker (“Crooker”). Claims 33, 34, 40, 41, 47 and 48 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Crooker and optionally in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,234,326 to Galli et al (“Galli”). In addition, claims 35-37, 42-44, and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Crooker, optionally Galli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,121,956 to Eger (“Eger”). Claims 35-39, 42-46, and 49-53 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Crooker, optionally Galli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,808,621 to Torrey (“Torrey”).

Rejections of Claims 33-34, 40-41, and 47-48

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) rejection of claims 33-34, 40-41, and 47-48 and the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejection of claims 33-34, 40-41, and 47-48. As discussed

in greater detail below, neither Crooker nor Galli anticipates or renders obvious proposed amended claim 33, and claims 40 and 47. Specifically Crooker at least fails to teach the limitation “wherein the mould includes means for retaining the plurality of studs in the seats, and the retaining means is separated from the plurality of studs.”

With respect to Crooker, at page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner recognizes that “Crooker’s stud contacts magnet 49 instead of never contacting magnet 49.” (See Office Action, page 6). Therefore, Crooker cannot teach that the “retaining means is separated from the plurality of studs”(emphasis added) as recited in claims 33, 40, and 47. The Examiner relies on Galli for allegedly teaching the claimed predefined degree of clearance. See Office Action, page 3. Galli, which is silent as to providing any studs whatsoever in a tire, also cannot teach or suggest that the “retaining means is separated from the plurality of studs”(emphasis added). Therefore, none of the applied references teaches or suggests each and every limitation of claims 33, 40 and 47. Accordingly, claims 34, 41, and 48 are allowable at least due to their corresponding dependence from claims 33, 40 and 47. The rejections of claims 33, 34, 40, 41, 47, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) and § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 35-39, 42-46, and 49-53

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 35-37, 42-44, and 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Crooker, optionally Galli, and further in view of Eger, and the rejection of claims 35-39, 42-46, and 49-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Crooker, optionally Galli, and further in view of Torrey.

The shortcomings of Crooker and Galli are discussed above. Eger teaches a tire with cup-shaped metallic inserts 6 which are tightly fit into the tire. See Eger Specification column 3,

lines 25-40. Torrey teaches a tire in which friction elements 17 are placed in the tire mold and are attracted to, and become affixed to, the magnets 16. Both references are entirely silent as to the claimed "wherein the mould includes means for retaining the plurality of studs in the seats, and the retaining means is separated from the plurality of studs." Claims 35-39, 42-46, and 49-53, therefore, are allowable at least due to their dependency from claims 33, 40 and 47.

Applicants respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 33-53 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 33, 40, and 47 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. Rather, as noted above, Applicants' proposed changes to claims 33, 40 and 47 are directed toward subject matter which the Examiner acknowledges as not being taught by Crooker. Accordingly, Applicants' proposed claim amendments place this application in condition for allowance and should allow for immediate action by the Examiner. Applicants therefore request entry of this amendment and a timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 4, 2006

By: 

Meredith H. Schoenfeld
Reg. No. 52,418